

Appl. No. 10/065,372
Amd. Dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action Dated 10/10/2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-32 remain in this application. Applicants have amended paragraphs 10 and 38 of the specification.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 30-32 are allowed. The Examiner further indicated that claims 2-13 and 15-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. For reasons stated below, Applicant believes that the base claims from which these claims depend are allowable and that there is no need to rewrite these claims in independent forms. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully defers rewriting the claims at this time.

Corrections

While not required by the Examiner, Applicant has made amendments to the specification, claims and drawings to resolve certain errors.

Paragraphs 10 and 38 have been amended to eliminate clerical errors and designate trademarks.

In claim 13, Applicant has replaced the term "apparatus" with "downhole drilling tool" to properly relate to claim 1.

In Figure 6, reference line 78 has been shifted to point to the cavity as described in paragraph 0043 of the specification. Reference numbers 30 and 80 have been added for clarity, and for consistency with Figure 3A. Shading lines have been added to item 80 to clarify figure.

No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Appl. No. 10/065,372
Amd. Dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action Dated 10/10/2003

Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to the use of the term Powerpulse in claim 11. Applicants have amended claim 11 to resolve the error. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment obviates the objection.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1, 14 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Sharp et al. ('067). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of the claims relate to a drill collar and a downhole drilling tool. The Sharp patent relates to a wireline unit lowered into a wellbore on a wireline cable 30 as depicted in Figure 1. As described in paragraph 0007 of Applicant's specification, the claimed invention relates to operations involving severe drilling environments and harsh drilling operations. Sharp fails to contemplate a tool for use under such conditions or centralizers for use in a drill collar.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Sharp fails to teach, disclose or even suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 19-0610 (Reference Number 19.0331).

Appl. No. 10/065,372
Amd. Dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action Dated 10/10/2003

Date: _____

1/8/04

Respectfully submitted,

J.L. Jennie Salazar, Reg. No. 45,065
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
200 Gillingham Lane MD 9
Sugar Land, TX 77478
Telephone: (281) 285-8809
Facsimile: (281) 285-8821